

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4, 9-11, 14-16, and 20-22 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 9-11, 14-16, and 20-22 are allowed. Claim 1 is amended.

Reconsideration of the claim rejections are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### **Interview Summary**

The undersigned wishes to thank the Examiner for her courtesies extended during a telephonic interview conducted on or about March 1, 2010.

During the interview, the undersigned inquired as to the status of claims 9-11, 14-16, and 20-22 since these claims were listed as being allowed on pages 1 and 5 of the Final Action, but listed as rejected on page 2 of the Final Action.

The Examiner indicated that the listing of claims 9-11, 14-16, and 20-22 as being rejected on page 2 of the Final Action was a typographical error, as these claims are allowed.

During the interview, the undersigned proposed amending claim 1 to include some subject matter of allowable claim 15. The Examiner suggested that such amendments may overcome the prior art of record.

The undersigned proposed three alternative claim 1 amendments to the Examiner in a subsequent fax.

The Examiner responded in a voice mail that the 3<sup>rd</sup> alternative amendment was likely to render claim 1 allowable and should not require an RCE.

### **Claim Rejections - § 103**

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,995,930 to Hab-Umbach, U.S. Patent No. 6,078,885 to Beutnagel, U.S. Patent No. 5,548,647 to Naik, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,591,240 to Abe, as set forth in pages 2-5 of the Final Action.

The Examiner indicates (in p. 5 of the Final Action) that the prior art of record fails to specifically teach or disclose a comparator for comparing scores based on an overall distance measure between each synthetic waveform and the normalized waveform, an acoustic model score of a corresponding textual transcript of the synthetic waveform, and a language model score of a corresponding textual transcription to determine a corresponding one of the N-best textual transcriptions to output.

Thus, it follows that Hab-Umbach, Beutnagel, Naik, and Abe, alone or in combination do not disclose or suggest, *comparing scores based on the overall distance measure between the synthetic waveform and the original waveform, an acoustic model score of a corresponding textual transcript of the synthetic waveform, and a language model score of the corresponding textual transcription to determine a corresponding one of the N-best textual transcriptions*, as recited in amended claim 1. Further, claim 1 as amended, corresponds to the 3<sup>rd</sup> proposed alternative amendment, which the Examiner indicated should be allowable.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be allowed over Hab-Umbach, Beutnagel, Naik, and Abe. Claim 4 is believed allowed at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 1.

It is also believed that the amendment to claim 1 does not raise new issues as the added subject matter was previously examined with respect to claim 15.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/4/10

By: Robert J Newman  
Robert J Newman  
Reg. No. 60,718  
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, NY 11797  
Telephone: (516) 692-8888  
Facsimile: (516) 692-8889